



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,940	05/04/2001	Todd W. Herrick	C-472/TEC1154	8491
832	7590	03/24/2004	EXAMINER	
BAKER & DANIELS 111 E. WAYNE STREET SUITE 800 FORT WAYNE, IN 46802			ABRAMS, NEIL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2839	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/848,940	HERRICK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Neil Abrams	2839	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2839

Claims 1-3, 6, 21-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Paterek.

Paterek system figs. 1, 2 is to sealed housing for motor/compressor, terminal assembly 3, cluster block 8, pins 7, cavity 12 between the body and cluster block and a dielectric 10 filling the cavity 12 which is to be closed on full mating.

Claim 3, cavity 12¹ is closed; claim 6, material 10 is a polymer. Other claims are similarly met by Paterek.

Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paterek in view of Elbling, Iizuka, Katoh, Onoda, Okabe and Mattis.

While for claims 1-3, etc above rejection adequate, should issues arise use of sealed housing for motor and compressor also taught by Iizuka, see fig. 10. Obvious to form Paterek housing 4 such a manner.

For claim 1, ^{line 14}
^ material filling the cavity Paterek fig. 2 includes a dielectric coating material 120 that fills the cavity between the terminal body (cup) and the cluster block 14. Elbling added for further depiction at 34 of types of materials useable for coating 10. Also note that after full mating the coating 10 would fill substantially all of the space 12 between the mated connectors. Note that coating 10 is readable as a separate material and would be applied to the terminal assembly by molding (in liquid form and ^{cured} ~~solid~~) as in case of Elbling.

As an alternative basis for claim 1, ^{of rejection}
^ ~~of rejection~~ line 14 also obvious to fill space 12 with fluid epoxy in view Onoda, fig. 6 at 140, the material to be cured and solidified col. 1 line 58. Mattis shows other material usable in such combination. The epoxy or

gel use would prevent leakage into out of the case. Onoda equipment use is considered analogous to Paterek compressor use. Epoxy together with or in place of gaskets 21, 22 would provide a high degree of protection.

Above rejections apply to all of claims 2-27.

As another alternative, for claims 1, 9, 16, 21 also obvious to provide Paterek cluster block 8 with epoxy, grease or gel in view of Okabe at 5, as well as Katoh and Mattis, see fig. 2b, gel filled plug module 16.

For Okabe, connector is of general use and the epoxies 36 or 5 are to be solidified. For claim 1, the Okabe space filled by epoxy 5 or 36 is readable as all of free space since other spaces are occupied by contacts. For claims 9, 16, 21, only requirement is that some cluster block spaces be filled by epoxy.

Use of grease Katoh, or gel, Mattis also adequate. Any of these or Okabe epoxy would provide waterproofing and corrosion prevention.

These are all of advantage in Paterek type system.

For claim 16, limitations are readable on use of Paterek coating 10 together with epoxy filled cluster block as discussed above or on epoxy filled cluster block with filled terminal assembly as suggested by Onoda at 140, etc.

Applicant's arguments filed with the amendment and pertinent to above rejection have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. ***.

Use of Paterek O-rings show importance of sealing. Onoda at resin 140 discloses another way to provide sealing. For the "dielectric in the cluster block" alternative, Okabe is most pertinent, but Mattis and Katoh all are clearly applicable to

Art Unit: 2839

other type plug connector where corrosion prevention would be a factor. For Katoh, col. 3, lines 54-56 seems to only refer removal of the grease layer at the contact abutment areas hence is not critical. For claim 4, Paterek spaces at 9, fig. 1 provide means for ingress ~~grease~~ of material. Dependent claim do not appear to be specifically at issue and are treated together with parent claims. Note that claims 1, 9, 21 require dielectric in the cavity or in the cluster block hence material 10 of Paterek is adequate.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Abrams Neil at telephone number (571)272-2089.


NEIL ABRAMS
EXAMINER
ART UNIT 322